UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/500,838	02/02/2005	Daniel W. Chan	56792(71699)	1171
	7590 12/04/200 NGELL PALMER & D	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 5587		HARRIS, ALANA M		
BOSTON, MA 02205			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1643		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/500,838	CHAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alana M. Harris, Ph.D.	1643	

	Alana M. Harris, Ph.D.	1643				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>29 October 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.076	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 29 October 2008. A brithe date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply	or any extension thereof (37 CFR 4	1.37(e)), to avoid disr	nissal of the			
AMENDMENTS						
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for 						
appeal; and/or	ter reminer appear by materially rec	accoming or companying a	10 100 400 101			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	* **	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			,			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
	7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>3-5,9-12,34,39 and 62</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>40</u> .						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:						
	/Alana M. Harris, Ph.D. Primary Examiner, Art U					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicants have directed the Examiner's attention to the specification, page 47, Example 1 for support of the limitation added to claim 3, rejected under 112, 1st New Matter Rejection. The Examiner has reviewed this citation and notes the citation is not commensurate with the language of the claim. The last full sentence on page 47 of the specification notes peaks of Markers II and III showed higher expression levels on average among specimens from cancer patients when compared to controls while the remaining peaks, I, IV, V and VII demonstrated the inverse expression pattern. This is in contrast to the language within claim 3, wherein the increase of the selected markers and the decrease of the selected markers are not compared or correlated to any control levels. The claim cites the need of only an increase or a decrease in order to indicate ovarian cancer. It seems the specification requires both the increase and decrease of markers opposed to controls in order for ovarian cancer assessment. Moreover, the proposed amendment to the claims to delete "known" and replace with "additional" would not preclude the art rejections.